up the efficiency, and they must also see to the claims of the men in service. The recruitment must be left to their discretion. A hard and fast rule is not suitable, and Government cannot accept the principle.

SUBJECT No. 31.

Time-limit for the disposal of Civil and Criminal cases.

Messrs. K. T. Devappa, Tirthahalli Taluk, and Shanbhog Sankarappa, Holalkere Taluk.

Mr. K. T. Devappa.—It is necessary that there should be a maximum limit of time within which both in the Civil and Criminal courts, cases should be disposed of. As per existing practice, some cases drag on for a number of years and it will be very inconvenient and troublesome to the parties to attend the court many a time, and spend unnecessarily large amounts. The new special courts are located in distant places—sometimes more than 50 miles away. Witnesses simply decline to go. If a maximum time is fixed, there will be no room for such difficulty to the parties.

Mr. Sankarappa.—Some of the criminal cases will be allowed to drag on for a long period. By lapse of time, the parties and witnesses may entirely forget material facts connected with the case, and as such, there is likely to be injustice. A time-limit will avoid this trouble.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—The delay in the disposal of the cases is mainly due to the parties and witnesses on some of whom summons cannot be served in time. At times, the party himself prays for adjournments and if he satisfies the court that he cannot attend the court on the day fixed, the court has to comply with his request. The delay is unavoidable, and is comparatively slight so far as the court is concerned. A limit will mean hasty disposals, and, then applications to set aside the order. Even the Chief Court is approached. All efforts are made to dispose of cases speedily.

Mr. K. T. Devappa.—I admit. But without a limit there is cause for delay.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—Adjournments are given for sufficient reasons.

Messrs. K. T. Devappa and D. S. Mallappa.—People get ruined by the delay. The value of the evidence is lost.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—It is known. What is the remedy ?

Dewan.—We will consult the Chief Court to suggest measures to prevent delay. We will do what is possible.

SUBJECT No. 32.

Abolition of the Bench Courts. The Amildars and Sub-Division Officers to exercise Magisterial functions as formerly.

Messrs. Chikmallappa, Gundlupet Taluk, Kullegowda, Nagamangala Taluk; Puttasamigowda, Malvalli Taluk, and Chikmayigowda, Bannur Municipality.

Mr. Kullegowda.—The Bench Magistrates' Courts in the taluk headquarters may be abolished, as sufficient powers are not given to these Magistrates, and people are not saved the worry of going to other courts in distant places. This work can easily be entrusted to Amildars.

Mr. Chikmayigowda.—We cannot expect justice in the Bench Magistrates' Courts, as the Magistrates are not generally qualified men and as they do not know much of Law. The Amildars may be invested with the powers they originally exercised.

Mr. C. Narayana Setti.—There will be no abuse of Law in the Bench Magistrates' Court, as they exercise powers only under a few sections. These courts decide mostly questions of common sense and are very useful to the public. People will in many cases be saved the trouble of going to other courts as efforts are made to effect compromises in all possible ways.